REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments cand in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 10, 18, 24, 28, 37, 44 and 49 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-52 are now pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the interview conducted on June 21, 2005. A Statement of Substance of Interview is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-9 and 28-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action asserts that the limitation "storing the layout template and the content as database records separate from the web page database record" was not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. However, Applicant considers this limitation to be unnecessary for patentability and has, accordingly, deleted the limitation from claims 1 and 28. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Claims 1-2 and 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,460,041 to Lloyd (hereinafter "Lloyd"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to methods and tools for constructing a website. Rather than websites that retrieve static pages, embodiments of the present invention allow construction

- 16 -

of a "database driven website" where each web page is stored as a database record having fields that reference various parameters, including, for example, a layout template and content. As noted in Paragraph [0006] of the specification, pages within websites so constructed may then be displayed by retrieving the fields in the corresponding records, rather than static pages, to access, for example, the layout template and content records for display. In this regard, the layout template, as that term is used in the specification, refers to a template which defines the layout of a webpage, including the location on the page of navigational link areas (see paragraph [0019], for example). The layout template is not associated with and does not specify any content of the webpage (see, for example, paragraphs [0020] and [0025]). Thus, a single layout template may be used for multiple web pages. For example, as illustrated in Figure 10, a single layout template ("Corporate 1") can be used for multiple pages (shown under the heading "Page Title"). Accordingly, amended independent claims 1 and 28 recite that "the layout template does not specify content."

Lloyd fails to teach or suggest at least this feature. Although Lloyd makes references to a "template," the template of Lloyd is not a "layout template," as that term is used in the present application. The template of Lloyd is a substantially complete web page, including references to specific content embedded within the template. For example, in describing Figure 5 in col. 9, lines 1-17, Lloyd interchangeably refers to reference numeral 196 as "web page templates" and "web pages." More importantly, Lloyd notes that when the web page 196 is opened, "coding embedded with the web pages 196 may contain instructions to pull data 198 or content 198 from the table 192." Lloyd, col. 9, lines 9-12. Thus, the template 196 itself includes references to and specifies particular content. As a result, the template 196 of Lloyd cannot be used generically for multiple web pages. Thus, Lloyd fails to teach or suggest a layout template that "does not specify content."

Thus, independent claims 1 and 28 are patentable over Lloyd. Claim 2 depends directly from allowable claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for

- 17 -

additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claim 29 depends directly from allowable claim 28 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason.

Claims 3 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd. Claim 3 depends from allowable claim 1, and claim 30 depends from allowable claim 28. Thus, claims 3 and 30 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claims 4-6, 10, 15-17, 31-33, 37 and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,352 to Cohen (hereinafter "Cohen"). Claims 4-6 depend from allowable claim 1, and claims 31-33 depend from allowable claim 28. Claims 4-6 and 31-33 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 10, 15-17, 37 and 42-43 for the following reasons.

As described above, embodiments of the present invention allow construction of a "database driven website" where each web page is stored as a database record having fields that reference various parameters. One such parameter may be a page-type. As noted in Paragraph [0019] of the specification, a page-type may correspond to an application object, such as a calculator, calendar, web mail, catalog or a guestbook, for example. Thus, a web page may be stored as a database record with a field of the database record referencing a separately stored application object. Applicant has amended independent claims 10 and 37 to recite that "each page-type correspond[s] to an application object." Thus, claims 10 and 37 allow "a user to create one or more web pages for the website by specifying parameters for said one or more web pages, wherein _the parameters include the page-type_ of the web page ...."

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Lloyd does not specifically disclose such a feature. Rather, the Office Action cites Cohen as teaching such an application object in col. 4, line 42 to col. 5, line 64. The cited sections of Cohen disclose a scripting program which allows a higher-order level of instructions embedded within a script with a set of new delimiters. The

- 18 -

instructions do not teach or suggest the use of an application object to be invoked. Accordingly, Cohen fails to teach or suggest at least that feature of claims 10 and 37.

Thus, independent claims 10 and 37 are patentable. Claims 15-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 10 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 42-43 depend directly from allowable claim 37 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason.

Claims 7-9, 24, 34-36 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd in view of Lemay. Claims 7-9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1, and claims 34-36 depend from allowable claim 28. Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 24 and 49 for the following reasons.

Independent claims 24 and 49 recite the same feature as that described above with respect to claims 1 and 28. Specifically, each of claims 24 and 49 recite a "layout template" which "does not specify content."

As noted above, Lloyd fails to teach or suggest this feature. The Office Action asserts that Lemay discloses a "layout template that defines a homepage and navigational areas on the top-level web pages for displaying navigational links." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Lemay. As noted in an earlier communication, Lemay teaches providing an organizational hierarchy in a manner such that users can easily know their position within the website. The web pages contemplated in Lemay are the prior art static web pages, where each web page is stored as a preset, separate document in the file. Lemay includes no teaching or suggestion relating to creating and storing web pages as database records as disclosed in the instant application, or storing various elements defining a web page as fields within web page

- 19 -

database records. Accordingly, Lemay fails to teach or suggest any layout template that does not specify content. Thus, independent claims 24 and 49 are patentable.

Claims 11-14, 18-23, 38-41 and 44-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd and Cohen and in further view of Lemay. Claims 11-14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 10, and claims 38-41 depend from allowable claim 37. Claims 11-14 and 38-41 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 18-23 and 44-48 for the following reasons.

Similar to claims 1 and 28 discussed above, independent claims 18 and 44 each recite a "layout template" that "does not specify content." As noted above, neither Lloyd nor Lemay teach or suggest such a feature. Cohen also fails to teach or suggest this feature. For at least that reason, independent claims 18 and 44 are patentable. Claims 19-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 18 and are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 45-48 depend from allowable claim 44 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason.

Claims 25-27 and 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd and Lemay and in further view of Cohen. Claims 25-27 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 24, and claims 50-52 depend from allowable claim 49. Claims 25-27 and 50-52 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

- 20 -

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1674.

Respectfully submitted,

Date _October 6, 2005_   By _Sanjeev Dhand_

KINTERA, INC.   Sanjeev K. Dhand
Customer Number: 27309   Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (858) 795-8915   Registration No. 51,182
Facsimile: (858) 795-3010

- 21 -